DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 907 EA 020 736

AUTHOR Grimmett, Peter P.; Crehan, E. Patricia
TITLE Teacher Development, Collegiality and Instructional Supervision: The Cases of Audrey and Barry.
SPONS AGENCY Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, Ottawa (Ontario).
PUB DATE 23 Feb 89
GRANT 410-85-0339; 410-86-2014
NOTE 41p.; Paper presented at the International Conference on Teacher Development: Policies, Practices, and Research (Toronto, Ontario, Canada, February 23, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; *Collegiality; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Instructional Improvement; *Supervisory Methods; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Improvement
IDENTIFIERS *British Columbia

ABSTRACT

Teacher development is theoretically possible in those instructional supervision settings that emphasize collegiality. The paper reports and analyzes episodes taken from two cases in a larger study which investigated the different outcomes in teachers' classroom development associated with hierarchical and collegial approaches to instructional supervision. The paper has five sections. The first examines how collegiality can become part of the instructional supervision process. The second section presents brief overviews of the case studies of Audrey and Barry, who were supervised by hierarchical and collegial lines, respectively. The third section presents episodes taken from each case and analyzes them. The fourth section discusses the two cases in terms of different types of collegiality. The final section offers some concluding observations about the nature of teacher development, collegiality, and instructional supervision. Appended are 40 references. (SI)

TEACHER DEVELOPMENT, COLLEGIALITY AND INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION: THE CASES OF AUDREY AND BARRY

by

Peter P. Grimmett
Director and Assistant Professor

and

E. Patricia Crehan
Assistant Professor

Centre for the Study of Teacher Education
University of British Columbia

Paper presented at the International Conference on "Teacher Development: Policies, Practices and Research" held at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto, Ontario, February 23, 1989.

The study reported in this paper was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (Grants #410-85-0339 & #410-86-2014). The authors gratefully acknowledge that this work could not have been carried out without this funding. The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the policy, position, or endorsement of SSHRCC. The authors also acknowledge the contributions of Maryl Stewart, Bruce McGillivray and Cindy Drosse to the data collection, data analysis and manuscript preparation aspects of the study respectively.

TEACHER DEVELOPMENT, COLLEGIALITY, AND INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION: THE CASES OF AUDREY AND BARRY[1]

The workplace of teaching is generally dominated by norms of self-sufficiency, privacy, reticence (Chism, 1985), immediacy and individualism (Jackson, 1968; Lortie, 1975) that organizational conditions of cellular isolationism (Lortie, 1975) tend to promote. Many teachers have peers but no colleagues (Silver, 1973). This state of affairs has been confirmed by studies that have documented the nature of collegial exchange in teaching (Bussis, Chittenden, & Amarel, 1976; Feiman-Nemser, 1983; Goodlad, 1984; Huberman, 1980; Lieberman & Miller, 1979) and found it to be fragmented and insubstantial. Goodlad (1984), for example, found that teachers function autonomously but that "this autonomy *seems* to be exercised in a context more of isolation than of rich professional dialogue about a plethora of challenging educational alternatives" (p. 186).

Dombart's (1985) practitioner's view from the inside suggests that this state of affairs is more he result of the prevailing organizational conditions than of teachers' wishes. It represents a powerful call for collegiality as a means of lifting teachers above their typical station of being mired in an unrewarding, denigrating workplace.

> The paradox of education as a profession is that it attracts people with visions into a system designed to frustrate those visions. . . .Love of subject and children impelled these people into the profession, and it is precisely what is driving them out of it or underground. . . .Experienced teachers do not talk about visions; it is too painful. Like soldiers at the front, we have learned to assume a flippant and hardened attitude. . . .So it is not that we are either shiftless or stupid that keeps us silent about visions. It is that we are tired--tired of being powerless pawns in a system that treats us either with indifference or disdain. . . .Take a look at the working world of the insider. You will find that it is not an apmosphere that nourishes visions. Though we teachers are numerous, we are virtually powerless. We affect none of the key elements in our working lives. (p. 71)

One consequence of this state of affairs is that many good teachers are opting to leave the profession (Rosenholtz, 1985, p. 350), causing researchers like Goodlad (1984) to suggest that "to get ahead in teaching is to leave it" (p. 188). Collegial work conditions are fostered, in part, to address this dilemma. They are designed to help teachers help one another in their quest to foster pupil achievement and development. To use Sizer's (1984) terminology, collegiality is a way of "empowering Horace" (p. 201), thereby releasing in a dialogue around teachers the rich knowledge they appear otherwise to withhold.

Many writers in instructional supervision (e.g., Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer, Anderson, & Krajewski, 1980; Glickman, 1985; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1988) claim that principals can enter into a collegial relationship with teachers when working to improve classroom practice. They would argue that supervisory intervention can

---

[1] Fictitious names have been used for participants in the case studies

become a joint learning experience in which both participants. but particularly the teacher, develop as professional educators. Schön (1988) has suggested that teachers develop in instructional supervision settings[2] when they engage in the "reflective transformation of experience" (p. 25). It would appear, then, that teacher development is theoretically possible in those instructional supervision settings which emphasise collegiality. The intriguing question this paper seeks to address is: to what extent do teachers develop through the reflective transformation of their classroom practice in an instructional supervision setting? A subsidiary question has to do with the nature of the collegiality permitted in the context of instructional supervision?

The Focus of the Paper

In addressing these questions, the paper reports and analyses episodes taken from two cases in a larger study (see Grimmett & Crehan, 1988) which investigated the different outcomes in teachers' classroom development associated with hierarchical and collegial approaches to instructional supervision. Hierarchical supervision was conducted along clinical lines (see Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer, Anderson, & Krajewski, 1980) in that the focus was on the analysis of teaching within the context of a helping relationship but no attempt was made to expose the teacher to recent research-verified knowledge about classroom management whereas the principal himself had had workshops in classroom management and instructional supervision processes. Collegial supervision also followed the clinical approach but combined it with the Hunter (1984) emphasis on a "common language"; that is, both principal and teacher had had workshops in classroom management and had continued to study the content together over and above their supervisory encounters. Each case involved a principal supervising a teacher for the purpose of analysing the latter's classroom management practices. Both dyads undertook two supervision cycles. Each cycle consisted of the principal observing the teacher and conferencing with him or her about the lesson. Two independent observers were also present during the lesson observation and took extensive field notes. These "thick-focussed" descriptions were used to develop a picture of the teacher's classroom management practices against which the principal's observations, which served as the sole basis for conference discussion in either case, could be compared. The supervision conferences were recorded on videotape (with no independent observers present) and later played back to each participant separately for purposes of a stimulated recall interview. The dialogue of each conference and stimulated recall interview was transcribed and these transcripts, together with the classroom field notes, constituted the principal data sources used in the development of the case studies.

The paper has five sections. The first examines how the benefits and conditions of collegiality can become part of the instructional supervision process in such a manner as to permit teachers to engage in the "reflective transformation of experience" (Schön, 1988). The second section presents brief overviews of the case

---

[2] Schön (1988) prefers to talk in terms of "coaching" rather than instructional supervision but his conception of coaching differs radically from that of Joyce and Showers (1982, 1983).

studies of Audrey and Barry. Audrey is an experienced but borderline teacher supervised by Brian along clinical but hierarchical lines; Barry is an experienced and highly capable teacher supervised by Margaret along clinical, collegial lines. The third section presents episodes taken from each case and analyses them according to the conditions which constrain or permit teacher development through the "reflective transformation of experience" (Schön, 1988, p. 25) The fourth section discusses the two cases in terms of different types of collegiality that can be established under the purview of clinical supervision. The final section offers some concluding observations about the nature of teacher development, collegiality, and instructional supervision.

COLLEGIALITY, REFLECTION, AND INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION

This section examines the benefits and conditions of collegiality and explores the theoretical view that collegial conditions can become operative in instructional supervision. It further examines the view that these conditions in instructional supervision can permit teachers to engage in reflection on their classroom action.

Collegiality and Its Benefits

Little (1987) has documented the benefits that teachers gain from close colleagues. Teachers derive instructional range, depth, and flexibility from working together. The structures of collaborative group work, for example, interclass visitation and observation, and, studying classroom-related issues together, enable teachers to attempt curricular-instructional innovations that they would probably not have tried as individuals. But it is not merely team work that produces this effect--it is the joint action that flows from the group's purposes and obligations as they shape the agreed task and its outcomes.

Teachers also derive influence among their ranks and respect from others, such as administrators, pupils, and parents, through collegial work conditions. "The more *public* an enterprise teaching becomes, the more it both requires and supports collective scrutiny" (Little, 1987, p. 496). This collective scrutiny breeds influence and respect among teachers. The highest levels of reciprocal influence reported by teachers in studies conducted by Meyer, Cohen, Brunetti, Molnar, and Lueders-Salmon (1971) at Stanford were reserved for schools in which teachers were both routinely visible to one another and routinely and intensively involved in teams. It would appear, then, that a combination of visibility (planning for teaching and actual classroom instruction is carried out in the presence of other teachers), shared responsibility, and widespread interaction heightens the influence of teachers on one another and on the school as a whole.

Little (1987) also suggested that teachers derive career rewards and daily satisfaction from conditions of collegiality. Working with colleagues helps teachers to shape their perspectives on their daily work. It also enables them to reduce what Lortie (1975) referred to as "the endemic uncertainties of teaching" (p. 134), which typically deny teachers a sense of success. Little (1987) described this specific benefit in the following way:

> Instead of grasping for the single dramatic event or the special

> achievements of a few children as the main source of pride, teachers [enjoying conditions of collegiality] are more able to detect and celebrate a pattern of accomplishments within and across classrooms (p. 497)

Professional recognition, professional involvement, and professional influence become rewards that keep teachers career-oriented and help them establish a high sense of efficacy.

Conditions of Collegiality and Instructional Supervision

Little's (1981) study of the norms and work conditions conducive to school improvement highlighted four conditions that, when present, appear to cultivate norms of collegiality and experimentation in schools:

> Teachers engage in frequent continuous and increasingly concrete and precise *talk* about teaching practice (as distinct from teacher characteristics and failings, the social lives of teachers...). By such talk, teachers build up a shared language adequate to the complexity of teaching, capable of distinguishing one practice and its virtue from another. . . .
> Teachers and administrators frequently *observe* each other teaching, and provide each other with useful (if potentially frightening) evaluations of their teaching. Only such observation and feedback can provide shared *referents* for the shared language of teaching, and both demand and provide the precision and concreteness which makes the talk about teaching useful.
> Teachers and administrators *plan, design, research, evaluate and prepare teaching materials together.* The most prescient observations remain academic ("just theory") without the machinery to act on them. By joint work on materials, teachers and administrators share the considerable burden of development required by long-term improvement...and make rising standards for their work attainable by them and by their students.
> Teachers and administrators *teach each other* the practice of teaching (pp. 12-13) (Author's emphasis)

The major authors writing about clinical supervision (Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer, Anderson, & Krajewski, 1980; Mosher & Purpel, 1972) would claim that each of these four conditions can be present when principals and teachers work together in the clinical approach to instructional supervision. This approach emphasizes "colleagueship" (Cogan, 1973, p. 68), the purpose of which is "the development of a professionally responsible teacher who is analytical of his [sic] own performance, open to help from others, and withal self-directing" (Cogan, p. 12).

This collegial relationship between supervisor and teacher does not imply similar and equal professional competencies. Rather, clinical supervision draws its strength from the heterogeneity nurtured in the association of dissimilar and unequal competencies:

> In clinical supervision the interaction of similar competencies at equal levels is generally less productive than the interaction of unequal levels of competence and dissimilar competences. Such productive heterogeneity may be observed when the clinical supervisor, highly competent in observation, the analysis of teaching, and the processes connected with the cycle of supervision, works with a teacher who is more competent in knowledge of the curriculum, his [sic] students, their learning characteristics and transient and persistent problems, and the school sub-societies to which they belong (Cogan, p. 68).

As a consequence, principals and teachers working together in instructional supervision can, theoretically, engage in talking about teaching, observing classroom practice, planning and preparing materials together, and generally teaching each other the practice of teaching. Further, these conditions, when operative, can permit, if not foster, what Schön (1988) refers to as the "reflective transformation of experience" (p. 25).

Reflection as Teacher Development

Reflective transformation of experience can be said to have taken place when a teacher manifests evidence of *naming* the things to which he or she will attend and *framing* the context in which he or she will attend to them (Schön, 1983 p. 40). This reframing of a problem situation enables practitioners to make use of their existing "repertoire of examples, images, understandings, and actions" (Schön, 1987, p.66). Reflective transformation thus engages teachers:

> in a kind of "seeing" and "doing" as--seeing their own situation as a version of the one they had observed...a process of metaphor, carrying a familiar experience over to a new context, transforming in that process both the experience and the new situation (Schön, 1988, p. 25).

In such a process, research findings would function in teachers:

> as a catalyst for seeing new puzzles in their classroom practice, enabling them to reframe tried-and-true patterns of classroom interaction in ways that permit exploration, experimentation, and subsequent improvement...as a metaphor that facilitates the reconstruction of prevailing views and patterns of practice to lead to new understandings of teaching and classroom action. (Grimmett, 1989, p. 124)

This view assumes that teachers derive the important concepts they use to structure their world and experiences not analytically, whether in the technological or deliberative modes of knowing (Zumwalt, 1982) or in the instrumental or conceptual approaches to decision-making (Kennedy, 1984)[3], but through experiential metaphors that permeate their thinking. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) introduced the

---

[3] For a fuller exposition of how these three broad ways of knowing, the technological, the deliberative, and the reflective, relate to teachers' understanding of research-validated knowledge and to an understanding of reflective practice, see Grimmett, 1989, and Grimmett, MacKinnon, Erickson, and Riecken, 1989, respectively.

notion of metaphor in the following way:

> We have found . . . that metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature. The concepts that govern our thought are not just matters of the intellect. They also govern our everyday functioning, down to the most mundane details. Our concepts structure what we perceive, how we get around in the world, and how we relate to other people. Our conceptual system thus plays a central role in defining our everyday realities. If we are right in suggesting that our conceptual system is largely metaphorical, then the way we think, what we experience, and what we do everyday is very much a matter of metaphor. (p. 3)

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) essentially pointed to the way in which our concepts are products of all our life experiences, personal biography, and professional socialization. The metaphors that permeate our minds structure how we think and act. For example, if one thinks of teachers as responsible professionals, one would presume that there are reasons for a teacher's classroom behavior that (even if the behavior per se were dysfunctional) must first be explicated, respected, and considered before that teacher can seriously be expected to undertake behavioral changes. According to this metaphor, the imitation of new behaviors that are inconsistent with the teacher's fundamental values and beliefs about teaching is, at best, short-lived and, at worst, illusory.

Metaphors would seem to appeal to what Connelly and Clandinin (1988) termed an *image*. Image, for Connelly and Clandinin, represents a filament within teachers' experience, embodied in them as persons and expressed and enacted in their practices and actions.

> An image reaches into the past, gathering up experiential threads meaningfully connected to the present. And it reaches intentionally into the future and creates new meaningfully connected threads as situations are experienced and new situations anticipated from the perspective of the image. Thus, images are part of our past, called forth by situations in which we act in the present, and are guides to our future. Images as they are embodied in us entail emotion, morality, and aesthetics. (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988, p. 60)

It can be argued, then, that the presence or absence of evidence of teachers engaging in this metaphorical transformation of their classroom experience is an acid test-like indicator of whether collegial conditions are operative and teacher development is occurring in the setting of clinical instructional supervision.

THE CASES OF AUDREY AND BARRY

These two cases were selected because they represented the contrasting approaches to instructional supervision investigated in the study. They were also

chosen because they represented what previous research (Glickman, 1985; Thies-Sprinthall, 1980; Grimmett, 1984) had characterized as typical cases of educative and miseducative supervision. Audrey was a low conceptual level (CL) teacher working with Brian, a high CL principal, a combination that has generally been found to have educative outcomes. Barry, a high CL teacher, was working with Margaret, a low CL principal, a combination which Thies-Sprinthall (1980) found to be generally miseducative.

The Case of Audrey: An Overview[4]

Audrey has a total of 15 years of teaching experience, ten at the intermediate level (grades 4-7) and five at the primary level (grades 1-3). She has taught in her present school, with her present principal, for four years. Prior to working with her current principal, Audrey had received two less than satisfactory evaluation reports and had, at one point in time, been placed on extended medical leave.[5] Although these events had occurred more than five years previously in a different school with a different principal, they had nevertheless scarred her sense of professional confidence and teacher efficacy, leaving her somewhat negatively predisposed towards instructional supervision.

Brian has a total of eleven years of experience as an administrator, one of which was as an elementary school vice-principal and ten as an elementary school principal, all within his present district. He has been principal of his present school for four years. Brian is viewed by his peers as an instructional leader, having had a provincial profile during the days when he worked with the local teachers' federation in the planning and implementation of modules designed to assist classroom teachers' professional development. Since becoming a principal, he had found that his apparent difficulty in finding time for classroom observation and conferencing had been exacerbated by the escalating demands on his time from central office, the community, and the daily routine of school life.

Audrey's Classroom Management Practices

At the time of the observations, Audrey was teaching a grade three class, whose enrolment increased from 25 to 30 pupils from the first to the second classroom visit. The pupils were seated in a traditional rows configuration for both lessons. The first observed lesson was Language Arts (seatwork and reading groups); the second, Arithmetic (a review of the six times multiplication table). The qualitative data collected by the two independent observers and the principal revealed problematic aspects in Audrey's practice of group management, pupil monitoring, lesson pacing and sequencing, and transitions from one activity to the next.

---

[4] The full version of this case study can be found in Grimmett & Crehan (1988, pp. 19-35)

[5] This information only became available to the research team at the end of the second post-interview conducted with Audrey after the second round of observation, conferencing, and stimulated recall. None of the independent observers was therefore privy to this at the time of either classroom visit.

Her group management problems arose, at least in part, from the way in which she handled the class when she herself was engaged with a small reading group. She appeared to have no routine procedures in place for dealing with disruptions caused by pupils within the group not bringing the required materials or by pupils not in the group interrupting her to ask permission to do something. Audrey also had problems in handling the pupils who were engaged in seatwork activity. She simply did not interact with those pupils at all, her involvement with each reading group absorbing her attention totally. Within the reading group itself, Audrey made some attempt to ensure pupil engagement. But she neither scanned the rest of the class visually, nor did she circulate among the seatwork pupils between each reading group session.

In the second observation, Audrey showed some improvement in her monitoring. During the 13 minutes of slate work, she actively and purposefully circulated to monitor pupil progress. However, she also stopped monitoring in order to find a key and go to a locked storage cupboard, there to locate some needed materials for the feltboard. From then until the end of the lesson, Audrey tended to focus on individual pupils often with her back to the rest of the class. Rarely did she visually scan to ensure that all pupils were on-task.

The pacing and sequencing of both lessons appeared to be slow and lacking in variety or challenge. Each reading group began with Audrey using flashcards on which were printed short phrases from the book being read. The pupils were asked to recite together the phrases on each card. Non-reciting pupils were asked individually to repeat the flashcard phrases. Audrey seemed determined to go through the whole set of about 13 or 14 cards, regardless of the level of pupil knowledge or interest. Following some seven minutes of reciting from the flashcards, the teacher herself began to read the story. Each pupil in turn around the circle, was then called upon to read aloud. The only variation in the pattern occurred when, about half way through this 15 minute segment, Audrey had the group read a few lines in unison. There was virtually nothing in the reading group sessions which provided variety or challenge to the pupils. A similar observation applied to the seatwork group who, without any help from the teacher, were expected to persevere for nearly 30 minutes with their reading comprehension worksheets. In the second lesson, there were five segments all of which focussed on the six times table. Although different props were used, the content and method of each segment were virtually identical. Building on her oral introductory activity, Audrey asked the pupils "What is 2x6, 3x6...12x6?" Further segments dealt with this same content using chalk slates. the pupils' math notebooks, and separate flash cards. The entire lesson appeared to be rote and repetition. As evidenced by the escalating off-task behaviour, the pupils seemed unmotivated to learn by the lack of variety in a lesson whose purpose was not to teach the six times table for the first time but to review it.

Although the sequencing of the first lesson contained few transitions, there was evidence of some disruption and loss of instructional time. For example, Audrey did not remind the second reading group that rulers were required. It became apparent after completion of the flashcard segment that four of the eight pupils were without rulers. As these pupils went to their desks to get their rulers, the seatwork pupils were disrupted. The first transition point in the second

lesson followed an animated and enthusiastic whole class activity focussed on multiplying by sixes. Without any closure to that lively discussion, Audrey suddenly told the pupils to return to their desks and, row-by-row, get their slates which were stored in two adjacent compartments on the bottom row of some open shelves. Two pupil monitors were assigned to hand a slate to each pupil individually; two others were asked to distribute the chalk. Because this transition lasted for about five minutes, the distribution of props became an activity in and of itself. About the same length of time was consumed by the return of the slates to the storage compartments. In point of fact, however, this second transition took nearly ten minutes because of the pupil-initiated washing of hands and desks. It was during this transition, rather than prior to it, that Audrey instructed the pupils to get out their math notebooks. Some five minutes passed before the entire class was ready to begin work. For the most part, transitions appeared to be concluded when the pupils concluded them. Audrey herself seemed to assume the role of an uninvolved spectator passively watching the events in her classroom arena. Altogether, the transitions consumed about one third of the 45 minute observation.

The Brian-Audrey Conferences

The Brian-Audrey conferences were conducted in a low-key fashion. The tone was one of politeness rather than friendliness. In the first conference, Brian focussed on Audrey's use of instructional time as it related to her day-book planning, her allocation of time to the small reading groups, and the purpose to which she used flashcards to enhance instruction. He also addressed the teacher's stimulus-bounded behaviour when dealing with the small groups and pursued the question of when pupils at that level were introduced to cursive writing. Brian did not engage in scene-setting, rapport-building banter at the beginning but began the lesson analysis almost immediately by asking eliciting questions. Initially, he emitted cues about the lesson rather than stating directly his concerns and proceeded in a soft-spoken, low-key approach. He seemed to read the conference situation and made conscious decisions to adjust or "flex" accordingly. For example, he sifted through the responses which came from the teacher and carefully chose those concerns he deemed sufficiently consequential and relevant to pursue during the conference. Further, he made a switch in conference strategy towards the end of the first conference from being facilitative of lesson appraisal to stating his concerns directly but tentatively, when the teacher seemed to be unable to pick up appropriately on the cues he had emitted. The entire first conference was marked by Brian's persistent pursuing and returning to his major concern of the teacher's use of instructional time.

The second conference saw Brian focus again on use of instructional time, particularly as it related to the teacher's use of flashcards, the lesson transitions, and the pacing and sequencing of instruction. In addition, he addressed the teacher's use of unclear terminology. Brian's approach to the second conference was similar to that which he had used in the first one. He began by eliciting information from the teacher for purposes of lesson appraisal and ascertaining the complexity of the actual teaching situation but quickly resorted to stating his

concerns much earlier than in the first conference. Brian's tentative tone of voice and supportive body language accompanied his increasingly directive strategy in a manner which appeared to soften the impact of what he was saying. Moreover, he issued praise and supportive feedback to the teacher on aspects of her teaching in which she had shown a real desire to improve. He also attempted to make connections between and among various aspects of the lesson (e.g., the teacher's disorganized prop distribution and the slow pace of the lesson) which the teacher failed to perceive and grasp. In the final analysis, however, Brian did not force his interpretations upon Audrey because of his undying respect for the professional autonomy of teachers. It is not clear from the two conferences whether Brian conceives of professional autonomy as a teacher's right to individualistic classroom behaviour or as collegial responsibility to maintain and improve competent teaching practices. It would seem from his conference actions that Brian was not clear on this distinction and therefore allowed the notion of professional autonomy to prevent his ensuring that the teacher grasped clearly the general focus and specific details of concerns he felt were consequential to pupil learning in her lessons.

Audrey's responses to Brian's eliciting questions and his subsequent direct stating of concerns suggested that her previously negative experience with supervisors was influencing her behaviour in this setting. She did not offer a critique of her own teaching, nor did she agree or disagree with the supervisor's feedback. Rather, she tended to act defensively in the conference, indulging in instances of disparaging the pupils' behaviour and rationalizing her own. Each conference essentially pinpointed her lack of adequate monitoring but in both cases she attributed blame for the instructional shortcomings in the lesson to the pupils themselves. Indeed, her projection of blame seemed to suggest that it was the pupils' responsibility to behave appropriately and not her responsibility as teacher to expect that they do so and enforce such expectations through consistent monitoring and purposeful scanning. The attribution of blame, however, was only one version of her projecting responsibility for the lesson onto the pupils. When it became clear that the distribution and collection of props actually slowed down the lesson pacing, she enunciated that she could not deny these allegedly deprived children their wish to collect and hand in their chalk slates on an individual basis. Whether through the attribution of blame or the projection of a preference holding deleterious consequences for the pacing of the lesson, Audrey essentially shifted responsibility for her actions as instructional leader in the classroom onto the pupils.

Such denial of responsibility is characteristic of a low conceptual level person. But it was not merely the idea of responsibility that Audrey was inclined to deny; she also attempted to deny reality. As far as she was concerned, both lessons observed were not typical of what usually happens in her classroom. By using this low level neutralization tactic, Audrey did not have to accept the principal's recorded observations and data interpretations. Consequently, she maintained that the problem with the first lesson was not that it was not well planned but that it was overplanned, causing her to be unduly constrained by its stifling structure. And in the second lesson she refused to accept the connection made by Brian between and among the various dimensions of classroom management, particularly the link between prop distribution and lesson pacing. Audrey's denial of

responsibility and reality also manifested itself in her use of non-sequiturs (which had the effect of bamboozling Brian) and her assertion of her professional autonomy as a teacher when the principal's stating of concerns became too incisive and close for professional comfort. At the same time, she appeared to respond positively to a limited number of suggestions. These suggestions were, however, largely non-threatening in the sense that they did not require wholesale or radical changes in her teaching.

The Case of Barry: An Overview[6]

Barry has a total of 20 years of teaching experience, of which the most recent two have been at the intermediate level (grades 4-7). His prior experience includes 16 years at the secondary level (grades 8-12) and two as a district consultant. Barry has taught in his present school for two years, both of them with his current principal. During the course of these two years, Barry had engaged in five supervisory cycles with Margaret and they had worked collaboratively in the study of classroom management for at least six months. Margaret, the principal, has a total of eight years of experience as an administrator, three of which were as an elementary school vice-principal and five years as an elementary principal. All eight years were spent in her present district, last five of which she has been principal in her current school.

Barry's Classroom Management Practices

At the time of both observations, Barry was teaching a grade six class which was seated in a traditional rows configuration with the boys on one side of the room and the girls on the other. The first observation began with a short, drill-type math review, followed by a science lesson dealing with the skeletal structure of the human body. The second observation, which started with a brief interval of silent reading, was a mathematics lesson. This lesson involved three activities: speed drills, arithmetic limericks, and a newspaper article about the cost of car rentals. The latter two activities had as their objective the development of numerical reasoning.

The qualitative data collected by the two independent observers and the principal revealed both strengths and weaknesses in Barry's classroom management behaviour. Across both observations, the climate was strong; however, the arrangement of the classroom conveyed a disorderly impression. There were also inconsistencies in Barry's management of instruction and transitions, his provision of rules and procedures, and his handling of pupil behaviour which varied more in emphasis than in kind from the first to the second observation.

Barry seemed to have the ability to maintain a task-oriented, business-like approach to class activities while simultaneously engendering a warm and friendly atmosphere between the pupils and himself. He appeared relaxed and unflappable

---

[6] As with the case of Audrey, the full version of this case study can be found in Grimmett & Crehan (1988, pp. 36-61)

as he laughed and joked with the pupils who clearly knew that when he called for quiet, he meant business. While they were obviously having fun and enjoying their work, the pupils were also challenged by the stimulating, thought-provoking activities, particularly in the second observation. At the same time, Barry's classroom conveyed the impression of being overcrowded and cluttered. Although the classroom seemed small for the 30 pupil desks, the sense of crowdedness was exacerbated by the presence of lots of other furniture on the perimeter of the room. On three sides, the wall space was taken up by cupboards, shelves, and tables. Nearly one third of the chalkboard at the front of the room was behind a cupboard of science supplies and Barry's own desk and filing cabinet, both of which were piled high with things. The amount and size of the peripheral furniture made it necessary to place the rows of desks quite close together, thus restricting the traffic lanes and creating congested movement for both Barry and the pupils. In addition to its effect on freedom of movement, the excess furniture also affected the ease with which pupils could see the instructional displays. The overhead projector and screen were placed in one back corner of the room, a placement which required the pupils to turn around in their desks in order to see the visuals. However, without some drastic changes in the quantity of furniture and the amount of stuff piled up around the classroom, there appeared to be nowhere else to put the overhead.

It was clearly evident in Barry's management of instruction that he not only planned thoughtfully the substantive content of the lesson, but also used effectively a variety of monitoring techniques to ensure task engagement. That his planning had been done carefully was evidenced by the variety of materials and activities incorporated into both the math and health science parts of the lesson. During the review segments, the pupils were eager to respond to Barry's questions. For the most part, their interest was sustained by the brisk pacing and sequencing which characterized the lesson. Throughout both review segments and the ensuing seatwork activity on the skeletal structure, Barry encouraged on-task behaviour and monitored pupil progress by active, purposeful circulation. He also made effective use of visual scanning and "selective pausing" as he moved around the class. Not unrelated to these two monitoring techniques was Barry's sensitivity to auditory cues. He seemed to exercise sound judgment in response to these cues. Sometimes he looked in the direction of the sound and apparently decided to ignore it; other times, he looked and reacted non-verbally; yet other times, he responded verbally. He seemed to have a favourite saying that "I don't want spectators and workers; I just want workers". The pupils' almost instant return to the task at the hand suggested that they knew he meant business when he used those words.

Apart from the introductory silent reading segment, the second observation began like the first with a series of math speed drills. Except for the fact that it reviewed addition and subtraction instead of multiplication, the drill was conducted in an identical manner. Barry's subsequent presentation and explanation of the math limericks required a high level of abstract reasoning on the part of the pupils. Although he clarified terms, provided examples, and asked the class for examples, he seemed to be teaching only part of the class. About one third

of the 23 pupils in the class[7] appeared to be quite uninvolved during the presentation. They did not misbehave; they just sat passively and were not pressed to participate nor called on to answer questions. These same pupils were subsequently observed to be having difficulty with the limerick worksheets. If Barry was aware of this non-participating group, he took no action to encourage their involvement in this segment of the lesson. It is interesting to note in connection with this group that Barry did not monitor as actively as he had done during the first observed lesson. It was as if he had become engulfed not only by his own tide of enthusiasm, but also by the energetic cooperation of the involved pupils in his class--to the virtual exclusion of the others. It was only during the seatwork segment that Barry used his favourite exhortation about "no spectators, just workers". However, the pupils' response was less salutory than it had been in the first observed lesson.

It would seem that there could be a need for two separate math groups in Barry's class. For those pupils who were academically engaged, Barry's questioning techniques emphasized higher-order thinking skills. But for those who were not engaged in the interactive phase of the lesson, it could be argued that the math segment was pitched beyond their level. During the third segment dealing with the cost of rental cars, however, the whole class was actively and enthusiastically involved. It may well be the case that this activity, which required more concrete than abstract thinking, was deliberately planned to provide participation opportunities for those pupils who had found the limerick activity too demanding. The validity of this assumption notwithstanding, the previously uninvolved pupils did become actively engaged in the discussion of rental costs for different types of automobiles.

For each of the transition points between the three segments in the first lesson, Barry gave clear, concise, and precise instructions before starting the transition itself. The only observed problem came during the transition preceding the seatwork activity. Rather than circulating as the pupils were carrying out the pre-transition instructions to ensure that all pupils were doing as asked, Barry remained stationary at the front of the room. Some confusion ensued as the pupils did the circulating while simultaneously asking for procedural clarification. The clarity of Barry's pre-transition instructions continued during the second observed lesson, which, like the first, consisted of three main segments. He also maintained his practice of giving the class advance warning of impending change and finish-up reminders for the segment at hand. Although he still did not circulate actively during the transitions themselves, the qualitative data indicate two changes in the way Barry handled transitions. First, instead of remaining stationary at the front of the room and becoming pre-occupied with the individual pupils approaching him, Barry was actively monitoring adherence to his directions by means of visual scanning. Second, whereas in the first observation there was a tendency for transitions and activities to overlap and sometimes merge, there was a clear demarcation between the end of a structured activity and the beginning of a transition. For example, Barry not only informed the class that

---

[7] Seven pupils were not in class for this lesson. According to Barry, four were in the library and three were "helping in the gym."

they had two minutes to get ready for the limericks, but also told them in very precise terms what to do in order to be ready. Unlike the first observation, Barry did not attempt to explain how to do the limericks activity as part of the transition. Rather, he waited until the transition was complete and then gave the instructions for the structured activity.

Generally speaking, Barry had clearly established rules governing pupil behaviour and academic expectations. There were equally clear procedures in place for routine functions and tasks in the classroom. For example, pupils were entirely familiar with the procedure for distributing the worksheets for the math speed drills. Barry also had various reminders about such things as file folders, report cards, and notebooks written on the chalkboard. As in the first observation, the math materials for both the speed drills and the limericks problem-solving activity in the second lesson were distributed and collected in an efficient and effective manner. In terms of rule enforcement, however, what had been only a minor occurrence during the first observed lesson became problematic in the second one. Although Barry did not state explicitly that hands were to be raised, the pupils seemed to know that call-outs were not permissible. Indeed, there were very few in the first lesson, despite the opportunity for them during the request for answers to the math and bones questions. But in the second lesson, the no call-outs rule was not consistently enforced. This lack of consistency was most evident in the final segment of the lesson during which the pupils had become excited and voluble over the car rental cost activity. The call-outs, together with some arguing over car names, and many pupils speaking simultaneously, contributed to a mounting noise level which made it difficult for anyone to hear anything.

That Barry managed pupil behaviour effectively during the first observed lesson has been alluded to repeatedly in the above sections. Given that the class seemed to be well aware of his behavioural expectations, it can be assumed that Barry must have established those expectations long before this late November observation. Throughout this first lesson, he took prompt action to correct any deviations from those expectations. During the two seatwork activities, he used an effective combination of active, purposeful circulation; visual scanning; and selective pausing. These selective pauses seemed to be an anticipatory action whose purpose was to prevent pupil behaviour from becoming either inappropriate or disruptive. Barry used visual scanning not only as a general monitoring technique, but also as a response to specific auditory cues. On these occasions, he frequently made eye contact with [illegible] pupils. Although Barry continued to use the same monitoring techniques [illegible] the second observed lesson, he did so with much less consistency. Whereas he had previously tried to ensure that all pupils were at least attentive to the task, Barry seemed to lose some of that attentiveness in the second observed lesson. Nowhere was the inconsistency between expectations and actual behaviour more evident than during the final segment of the lesson. Indeed, the frequency and loudness of the call-outs during that segment was such that some pupils, particularly those seated farthest away from the overhead projector, did not hear what was being said by either other pupils or the teacher. The situation appeared to be exacerbated by the location of the overhead projector in one corner of the classroom. This location resulted in

Barry having his back to most of the class. Although he did turn around from time to time to face the class, the frequency of that action was not sufficient for effective monitoring. Moreover, given the noise level, Barry could not hear the auditory cues indicating misbehaviour, much less respond to them. It would seem that a re-location of the overhead to a place near centre-front would have allowed Barry to face the whole class and thus be in a position to monitor the class using visual scanning.

The Margaret-Barry Conferences

The Margaret-Barry conferences were characterized by a generally supportive atmosphere. Both participants appeared to enjoy an easy, relaxed disposition which allowed them to engage in much good-natured banter and humour. In the first conference, Margaret focussed on Barry's clear expectations and his consistent enforcement of them, the timing and clarity of his directions for seatwork activities, and his classroom organization as it related to the distribution and collection of worksheets and to the class seating plan. In addition, she focussed on pupil on-task behaviour, particularly as it related to the teacher's monitoring behaviours of proximity to and eye-contact with specific, individual pupils, and on back-up activities for those pupils who finished assignments early. The second conference also focussed on Barry's expectations, the class seating plan, and pupil on-task behaviour as it related to the teacher's proximity to specific individual pupils during interaction. It also dealt with the challenging instructional material presented by the teacher, the variety of activities included in the lesson, the transitions that these changes brought about, and the principal's own agenda for the school of goal-directed teaching.

Margaret was extremely supportive in her feedback to Barry in both conferences. One aspect of her supportiveness was her frequent use of a "we" strategy to identify her own teaching with that of Barry's. She also presented data to the teacher in a neutral manner and generally adopted an eliciting orientation through her questions. In addition, she used positive statements as precursors to raising a concern and had a deep sense of respect for the teacher's approach to instruction, even though it differed in some ways from how she herself would teach. Margaret began both conferences with some rapport-establishing banter and invariably closed the conferences on a positive note. Her way of dealing with an experienced teacher could be characterized as "enabling." Yet the longer the supervisory relationship with any given teacher, the less input she allowed into the observation focus on the part of that teacher. This enabling, supportive style was characteristic of Margaret's supervision in both conferences but the second conference revealed certain difficulties in her execution of the supervisory role. First, there were instances of her engaging in a convoluted and verbose monologue in which her talk meandered and lacked a sharp focus. Second, she forfeited an opportunity to pick up on a cue emitted by the teacher and probe one of his instructional concerns. Third, she essentially reported her intent in supervisory conferencing as raising teacher awareness rather than fostering critical appraisal and reflection.

Barry's responses to Margaret's supportive modus operandi demonstrated the highly integrated nature of his thought structures. He displayed an openness to examining his classroom behaviours, particularly those for which the principal complimented him, and explicated the specific expectations and routines which he held for pupils and consistently enforced. He made it clear that the principal's supportive approach enabled him to examine his approach to classroom teaching. In this examination he was able to re-assess his own interpretation of a specific pupil's behaviour on the basis of the conference discussion. When he detected that the principal was using the conference to work towards her own agenda of more goal-directed teaching in the school, Barry was able to read what was happening without his confidence or concentration being disturbed. Further, when the principal's preoccupation with this agenda caused her to engage in a somewhat convoluted monologue (even to the point of forfeiting an opportunity to follow up a teacher volunteered concern), he listened politely but did not participate. This careful weighing of the principal's behaviour and the adjusting of his own actions to accommodate her agenda without compromising his own priorities marked his response patterns throughout the conference.

Barry also proved to be capable of defending his procedures and actions by explicating the reasons underpinning his choices. This he did without hint of defensiveness; had the principal's approach been anything but relentlessly supportive of his different yet acceptable teaching style, however, Barry admitted that he would have found it difficult not to act with compliance or in counter-dependent ways. One measure of the level of support he perceived was indicated in the amount of information about pupils and his own teaching that he volunteered to principal Margaret. He volunteered information about pupil cooperation in his class which allowed the principal to probe how he engendered such a state of affairs. He also volunteered a concern about involving more fully in the interactive phase of instruction the pupils on the left-hand side of the room. This happened to be a concern that the principal did not pick up on because she seemed, at the time, to be preoccupied with other considerations. Barry nevertheless did not let this deter him. He further volunteered a concern about "dead-time" at the end of a lesson when the pupils had finished their assigned work, had toiled hard in doing so, and needed a change of pace. Barry asked Margaret if she had any specific advice to give on this situation and he welcomed her suggestion of poetry reading because it appealed to his basis philosophy that such "fill-in" activities should be educationally sound and not be designed merely to "keep kids busy." Indeed, he extrapolated from this suggestion what he himself could have done in the lesson in question. This extrapolation was not only consistent with a high CL teacher open to suggestions, but it also presented him with a profound insight into the nature of his own teaching.

TEACHER DEVELOPMENT THROUGH REFLECTIVE TRANSFORMATION OF EXPERIENCE

This section presents episodes taken from the cases of Audrey and Barry and analyses them according to the conditions which constrain or permit teacher development through reflection. An assumption running through this analysis is

that evidence of the teachers engaging in the reflective transformation of their classroom experience can be regarded as a strong indicator that collegial conditions are operative and teacher development is actually occurring. In each of the two cases, there are fleeting examples of reflection taking place. Two episodes from the case of Audrey and two from the case of Barry will be analysed to illustrate the conditions which foster such transformation and the constraints which militate against the process.

Episodes from Audrey's Case

Both episodes from Audrey's case occurred during the second conference. The first one revolved around the discussion of instructional time as it related to the transitions that occurred during the distribution and collection of the slate-boards. The second one was also focussed on a discussion of instructional time.

Each episode consists of the relevant portion of the transcribed conference dialogue and a description based on the data contained in the dialogue and the recall interviews.[8]

Episode One: Transitions and Instructional Time

The first episode focusses on the teacher's use of instructional time during the distribution and collection of the slate-boards.

PRINCIPAL: Ok well enough on the lesson itself on the content. Certainly it, when you're, if this is what you're going to do with seeing the concrete things on the felt board and that was helpful to see the objects um you made it concrete by looking at the objects but they had to imagine two groups of them and three groups of them. Although there again they had the slates and they could, they could draw them out and check. That's, that's one of the things I look for when I'm in a classroom is how smoothly things flow from one to the next. From one activity to the next and although you intended them to get their slates out before you got into the first one, I mean that was, that was just an example of what you were saying at the beginning I guess but even later on when you wrapped up one activity and you wanted to switch, it was put the slates back, ah that's a *long* process. I don't know, I wonder if there's a better way of, of doing that?

TEACHER: You mean returning the slates?

PRINCIPAL: Ya, ya. It just seemed to drag out for quite a period of time. There was a lot of time involved with one row and then another row and then some really pushed it because then they decided their desks needed to be washed.

TEACHER: Oh I know (PRINCIPAL: Ya) Well that, I could have killed them. They've never done that before.

---

[8] To distinguish between the proceedings of the supervisory conference and those of the subsequent recall interview, a conscious decision was taken to describe the conference proceedings in the present tense and the recall interview proceedings in the past tense.

PRINCIPAL: They just put on a show for us.

TEACHER: Yes I think so.

PRINCIPAL: Well that's just a comment .

TEACHER: I don't know Brian, that part, that part has bothered me too that it takes so long, um, one of the reasons of course is that it takes a long time is there are thirty of them. And the other way around it is to have the slates either on their desks when they come in or have them be able to leave the slate on the desk with out returning it. Or simply put the slate, stand on sideways up by the floor and as they are lining up for recess or lunch that they could do it.

PRINCIPAL: Drop it back or even have the monitors pick them up. I don't know, it's just that I, I mean if that's part of the routine in some of you lessons, I don't know, I've watched you using the slate before and I like the idea. Um it is good because it is something they can do quickly and see and you can spot it in a hurry and clear it off. Um but if it is something you use quickly then if *takes* that amount of time to make the switch then something should be done and I don't know whether it's to have one person collect them all that quickly. Maybe this you can leave to the end of the lesson if you're going to be changing from one lesson to another then it might as well all be confused at the time. It's just, it just struck me sitting there that, that maybe it was longer for me watching than it was for you at the front but I think it took between four and five minutes total, just to get the slates back before they could move on to you know that now .

TEACHER: I have had them , returned by a leader in the front row.

PRINCIPAL: Doesn't work? Or is it.....

TEACHER: Ya it works.

PRINCIPAL: They get to do it all at the same time then do they? But you still only have five or six people going to them at any one time

TEACHER: Well.

PRINCIPAL: Well anyway.

TEACHER: Well, its, you know, that's good to remember. They like to return their own.

The conference focus returns to the use of time issue, with particular reference to the transitions that took place in the lesson before and after the activity in which the pupils used chalk slate-boards. Brian praises Audrey for using a felt board (on which concrete objects in rows of six were placed) and the slates to make abstract entities concrete for the pupils. He also suggests that the transitions before and after the slate activity were long and asks Audrey if she

can think of a better way to organize the distribution and collection of the props. Because the teacher does not immediately appear to be clear on the point, the principal continues by describing a scene which unmistakeably applied to the collection of the slates:

> It just seemed to be dragged out, for quite a period of time. There was a lot of time involved with one row and then another row, and then some really pushed it because then they decided their desks needed to be washed. (lines 243-246, Conference transcript)

Audrey responds by saying that she is bothered by the time loss but thinks that having thirty pupils inevitably elongates any distribution process. She feels she should have had the slates out ready before the lesson started and Brian suggests that the lengthy collection process could be curtailed by astute use of pupil monitors. To reinforce this point, Brian gives Audrey positive feedback about her pedagogical decision to use the slates but underscores the organizational aspect which can waste valuable instructional time:

> if it is something you use quickly and if it takes that amount of time to make the switch, then something should be done and I don't know whether it's to have one person collect them all that quickly. ... I think it took between four and five minutes total just to get the slates back before they could move on. (lines 267-270, 274-276, Conference transcript)

Audrey's response here is noteworthy. She begins to talk about the different approaches she has used for collecting the slates, such as having the pupil at the front of each row collect for that row. Brian interrupts to ask if this particular approach worked and Audrey confirms that it did. Brian suggests that it works because only five or six pupils are out of their desks at a time instead of all thirty. The teacher notes this point but adds that the pupils "like to return their own" (lines 278-288, Conference transcript).

Episode One: Analysis

When the principal concluded his description of the slate collection scene with reference to the fact that some of the pupils were washing their desks, Audrey started to realize that vital instructional time had been lost. Once beyond her rationalization about the effects of thirty pupils on any distribution/collection process, she concluded that, to have had the slates out prior to the lesson beginning, would have saved a considerable amount of valuable instructional time. Although Audrey has, to a limited extent, engaged in potentially defensive behaviour, she has nevertheless embarked on the genesis of reflective transformation. She has begun to see her classroom teaching in a different light, to the extent that she was prepared to entertain a suggested action as an hypothesis "to be tested first by mental elaboration or reasoning and second by overt action" (Grimmett, 1988, p. 7). However, the suggested action was neither explored nor examined but rather harnessed by the principal to make the point about using pupil monitors for collection purposes.

It is difficult to understand why the principal chose to focus on the collection process when Audrey's suggestion was clearly pertinent to the distribution aspect. One can only presume that the principal was too caught up in his attempt to constrain Audrey's thinking around the potential benefits to be derived from using pupil monitors, whether for distribution or collection of lesson props. The critical point, however, is that the possible consequences for Audrey's use of instructional time of having the slates already distributed before the start of the lesson were never probed. Further, the principal's emphasis on using pupil monitors to collect the lesson props at the very moment in the conference when Audrey was beginning to see the distribution aspect in a different way served to orient her thinking towards the collection process. As a consequence, she described how she had made use of the practice whereby the pupil at the front of each row had collected the slates for that row. Although this represented a reporting of an action tried in the past, it nevertheless could have served as a possible precursor to Audrey's reframing of the collection process used in the lesson observed. In other words, this could possibly have become a suggested action which she was prepared to test first by mental elaboration and then by overt action. The circumstances of the conference, however, make it impossible to ascertain whether this speculation is plausible or not--for the principal interrupted Audrey to reinforce the view that using pupil monitors is organizationally effective in the collection of lesson props. As if to cudgel the point, the principal presented a brief rationale for the organizational effectiveness of the suggestion he had made earlier. What this essentially represented was a "telling" of the possible consequences of reframing the lesson prop collection process in this way rather than a joint exploration of how the suggested action could possibly be worked out in practice. Not surprisingly, Audrey recounted her own, albeit shallow, rationale--the pupils like to return their own slates--for not having used pupil monitors in the lesson under discussion.

At one, possibly two, instances in this episode, Audrey seemed to be on the verge of reflectively transforming aspects of her classroom management practice. However, in both instances the principal was too mindful of his own suggestion that the teacher use pupil monitors in the distribution and collection of lesson props. As a consequence, the discussion did not probe the potentiality of Audrey's suggested actions and an opportunity to engage a teacher in the reflective transformation of her own practice was forfeited.

Episode Two: Transitions, Instructional Time, and Changes Next Lesson

The second episode chosen was similarly focussed around the discussion of instructional time:

PRINCIPAL: That might do it. How about yourself, anything that you would change? If you were to go at it again?

TEACHER: Well, (long pause) obviously I'd have self (garbled) I was horrified when they looked at me and said I hadn't asked for the slates to be handed out, um (long pause) and I think I'd like to speed it up. I'm not sure how is the best way

TEACHER: I'd like to speed it up. I'm not sure how is the best way is whether it's the monitor (PRINCIPAL: Oh ya) to do it.

PRINCIPAL: Speed up the slate business. Ya. How about the pace of the whole lesson? Would you have, I wasn't sure about that, it

TEACHER: With those kids, no I would not.

PRINCIPAL: Your pace was deliberate then.

TEACHER: Yes partly because of the kind of kids they are and partly because Monday morning you never know, you haven't a clue what they have been doing since Friday at three o'clock.

The conference draws to a close with Brian asking Audrey if she would change anything next time she teaches. Audrey responds by saying that she would like to speed up the distribution of the lesson props (in this case, the slates) but she is not sure whether using pupil monitors would in fact achieve that end. In the recall interview, the principal fastened on to the first part of this response and reported thinking that the teacher has finally got to the point of recognizing the need to speed things up. In the conference, Brian attempts to reinforce this point by probing whether she would also want to speed up the pace of the lesson. Audrey's response is that she would not quicken the pace with the pupils she has. This retort had an incredulous effect on the principal in the recall interview. Having earlier opined that she had finally recognized the point, he now realized that that view was premature; for the connection between the distribution of lesson props and the pace of instruction has been essentially lost on the teacher. In her recall interview, the teacher sheds some light on why she would not be in favour of quickening the pace of the lesson. All pupils except two, according to her, were on modified programs the previous year and did not begin regular curriculum work until late. Moreover, she reported, on Mondays (the day of the lesson observed) the pupils are always slow after a week-end of little sleep and next to no English spoken at home. In her view, twenty-five out of the thirty pupils in the class do not know English very well. The point about the children being half asleep on Mondays Audrey makes with Brian in the conference.

Episode Two: Analysis

As the conference drew to a close, Audrey responded to the principal's question about proposed changes in the next lesson by saying that she would like to speed up the distribution of the lesson props but that she was not sure whether using pupil monitors would achieve this end. Her tentative reframing of this aspect of the lesson was, however, accompanied by a misgiving about the appropriateness of the principal's suggestion for her particular class--a misgiving based on her own understanding of how the use of pupil monitors in the distribution aspect of the lesson had not worked very effectively. The principal, however, did not make the connection between pupil monitors and prop distribution; he was, at this point, more concerned about the collection process and its

ramifications for use of instructional time. As a consequence, Audrey's tentative reframing of the distribution aspect of the lesson became lost in the principal's attempt to drive home the point about the interconnectedness of classroom organization and lesson pacing

Whether Audrey's openness to restructuring the prop distribution (if and when appropriately explored) would have led to substantial change in her classroom practice is not the point at issue here; rather, it is that her openness to seeing her classroom practice as a possible version of the classrooms which had been documented in the Texas studies of classroom management (the findings of which the principal knew, particularly the association of classroom organization with lesson pacing) provided a beginning basis for the reflective transformation of that experience. As it was, the principal made no attempt to "give reason" to Audrey's inability or unwillingness to see the usefulness of utilizing pupil monitors with her particular pupils; rather, he attempted, albeit subtly, to impose his clarity of understanding about prop distribution and its concomitant effects on the pace of the lesson (formulated on the basis of propositional knowledge) without acknowledging his own inability or unwillingness to grapple with Audrey's very different way of making sense of the situation. In other words, the interaction of "unequal levels of competence and dissimilar competences" had not led to a "productive heterogeneity" as Cogan (1973, p. 68) had maintained it would but had resulted in an imposed heterogeneity largely determined not by unequal levels of competence but by unequal levels of legal-rational authority and power.

The consequence of this was that a further opportunity to engage the teacher in the kind of joint exploration that could lead to the reflective transformation of Audrey's classroom practice was again forfeited.

Episodes from Barry's Case

Both episodes from Barry's case occurred during the second conference. The first episode taken from Barry's case revolved around the discussion of teacher proximity to pupils and its relationship to pupil involvement during the interactive phase of the lesson. The second episode focussed on what a teacher can do to fill the final few minutes of a lesson in an educationally sound way so that vital instructional time is not wasted.

Each episode consists of the relevant portion of the transcribed conference dialogue and a description based on the data contained in the dialogue and the recall interviews.[9]

Episode One: Pupil Involvement in Lesson Interaction

---

[9] Recall that the present tense is used to describe conference proceedings and the past tense is used to represent reported thoughts and comments coming from the stimulated recall session.

This episode focussed on a discussion of how to involve certain disengaged pupils in the interactive phase of the lesson.

PRINCIPAL: Now the ones I did wonder about I commented on later in here were the ones

TEACHER: Like.....

PRINCIPAL: Yes, but you know when you went into that second one, the second limmerick then you moved over to those kids. Now they were, they were(??) amazingly involved but even so.....

TEACHER: It's interesting that you picked that because ah I think it was before we left ah you know the left side of the room and with my own class I think it's a couple of things, there's some strong personalities on the center and right side of the classroom. So there's Frank sort of central, Laura and Angie over the right

PRINCIPAL: Paulo

TEACHER: Paulo way over on the right side, ah Dario towards the right center and those kids tend to attract my attention and the attention of the rest of the kids. That leaves

PRINCIPAL: the quiet Annas and

TEACHER: That's right, the four or five not really you know not really flag waving kids either, so my intention tends to get directed to that part of the room and I know that I don't, I don't even get eye contact with them as much as what I should be.

PRINCIPAL: Yes.

TEACHER: Um and I think that though the kids that are involved there are also fairly reliable , are quite comfortable without, not being noticed.

PRINCIPAL: Yes, yes they are.

TEACHER: So that they reinforce for me

PRINCIPAL: But they're also hard working.

TEACHER: Ya.

PRINCIPAL: They're a hardworking group. You're still getting results with them too.

TEACHER: But I'm not sure what to do ....you know find some technique .....

PRINCIPAL: Well especially for instance when you're moving um near the overhead, when you moved to the overhead. When I think of it, those kids with whom you generally interact are much closer to the overhead which is where you

are. And you might think at a certain point of sort of changing that position so it's on the other side (overlap of voices)

TEACHER: I think I could almost flip the room around.

PRINCIPAL: You could try it. It would be really interesting to see how that effects what you see is happening with those kids.

TEACHER: Cause I, I don't get over to the left side of the room as much.
PRINCIPAL: Well it's ah, you know you're certainly successful in the sense that I watched the kids and they were just as involved, just from their own point of view they were just as involved even they were not doing as much talking as, not as much actual obvious interaction with you. They were still into it so you're successful at that. Probably if you found that those kids were just doing nothing then that would be, it would be sort of like jumping up and down and saying .....and get a wheel chair and that's really not happening.

TEACHER: There's this thing too. The kids that are there don't interact with the rest of the class very much.

PRINCIPAL: No.

TEACHER: You know either way, the others don't interact with them very much. It seems like they're almost a little class within the larger class. It's a strange (PRINCIPAL: Yes) anyway

PRINCIPAL: Um, just moving on in the lesson, um the um you know in some ways a lesson like that could tend to be .....

In the conference, the focus on the teacher's interaction with pupils is extended to include specific individuals discussed in the first intervention. Both Margaret and Barry talk about Paulo and others who have strong personalities, who seem to attract the teacher's attention and eye-contact a good deal, and who sit on the right-hand side of the room. The left-hand side of the room seems to be made up of quieter pupils who seem comfortable in getting less attention and eye-contact from the teacher and yet who, the principal confirms, are nevertheless hardworking and on task. Barry admits that he is not sure about how to involve in the interactive phase of the lesson the quieter ones who do little to attract his attention. In her recall interview, Margaret suggested that the workshops given by the research team on classroom management between the first and second intervention had helped both her and the teacher focus on room arrangement and the seating plan. The seating arrangement in the classroom had emerged as a focus in the first conference but the workshops had helped them crystallize the connection between and among the seating plan, teacher movement, and teacher-pupil interaction. In the conference, Margaret's response to Barry's concern about involving the quieter pupils builds on this connection in the following way:

P: Well especially, for instance, when your're moving near the overhead, when you moved to the overhead. When I think of it, those kids with whom you generally interact are much closer to the overhead which is

where you are. And you might think at a certain point of sort of changing that position so it's on the other side [of the room].

T: I think I could almost flip the room around.

P: You could try it. It would be really interesting to see how that affects what you see is happening with those kids. (lines 322-335, Conference transcript)

Although she ostensibly suggests that pupil proximity to the overhead projector could be a factor, the principal is essentially reinforcing the theme of teacher proximity to pupils for purposes of stimulating teacher-pupil interaction. This theme had emerged in the first conference and its reiteration here through the suggestion of changing the position of the overhead results in the teacher's willingness to consider a different room arrangement.

In the dialogue following the excerpt cited above, Margaret is quick to add that all pupils in the class appeared to be fully involved in the lesson regardless of how much interacting they had or had not done with Barry. In her recall interview she reported her reasons for the timing of this positive feedback. She was concerned that her suggestion about changing the position of the overhead might have been perceived by the teacher as a negative criticism of what had happened in the lesson. As a consequence, she quickly passed on the kind of feedback which countered such an interpretation and alleviated any possible anxiety it might have caused. In so doing, the principal reported working towards ways of improving basically competent practices through helping the teacher understand why the lesson had been successful despite the seating arrangement and his lack of eye-contact and interaction with some pupils on the left-hand side of the room. She also felt that, despite the concern on her part that had precipitated the anxiety-reducing feedback, the teacher knew that she was not engaging in negative criticism of him.

It is intriguing to note that principal Margaret has gone to some length to dissuade the teacher of any possible negative interpretation of her comments when she reportedly knew that he would understand her intent. It is further intriguing when the context of these events is taken into account. Barry had admitted that he is unsure of how to involve the pupils on the left side of the room. After Margaret's suggestion for change and immediate positive feedback, Barry is still musing about involving the quiet pupils who sit on the left-hand side:

There's this thing too. The kids that are there [on the left side of the room] don't interact with the rest of the class very much. You know, either way, the others don't interact with them very much. It seems like they're almost a little class within the larger class. It's strange. (lines 346-351, Conference transcript)

Clearly, Barry is too wrapped up in his concern about involving these pupils to interpret the principal's suggestion negatively. Moreover, he had essentially asked for help on this matter and most teachers who request help expect the principal to offer suggestions. There appears, then, to be little basis for Margaret's concern

about possible teacher negative interpretation of her comments. Rather, it seems to represent an instance in which she might possibly be a captive of her own prior experience as supervisor; that is, previously she could have given suggestions without the teacher first asking for them, leading to a possible negative perception by the teacher, and she now remembers the consequence but not the context of what happened. This speculation notwithstanding, the principal fails to pick up on Barry's concern about the pupils on the left constituting a class within a larger class. Could it be that he is elaborating mentally on her suggestion of moving the overhead projector and raising a question about whether factors other than proximity to the teacher are contributing to the difficulty he has in involving these quiet pupils in the interactive phase of the lesson? One will never know the answer to this connundrum because neither participant commented on this in their respective recall interviews and in the conference the principal chooses to move on to a different aspect of the lesson.

Episode One: Analysis

When Barry admitted to being unsure of how to involve the quieter pupils in the lesson discussion, there followed an intriguing dialogue about the relationships between and among the seating plan, the teacher's movement, and teacher-pupil interaction. The principal suggested that pupil proximity to the overhead projector (and thus to the teacher) could be a factor in preventing the quieter pupils, situated on the far left side of the room, from entering fully into the interactive phase of the lesson. She concluded by suggesting that Barry consider changing the position of the overhead projector. This suggestion appeared to spark a reframing of the classroom's arrangement on Barry's part. But this potential reframing--"I think I could almost flip the room around"-- was essentially a minor aspect of what was, for Barry, the consequential problem; namely, how to involve the quieter pupils who happened to sit on the left side of the room and who appeared to function like a class within a class. In other words, he had not *named* teacher proximity to the pupils as the thing to which he would attend, the principal had. Consequently, his potential *framing* of the context in which he would attend to this dilemma, i.e., changing the room around so as to restructure pupils' proximity to the overhead projector, essentially had an insouciant ring to it and did not constitute an instance of reflective transformation on his part.

It would seem that what Barry was struggling to name were the different levels of mathematics ability that seemed to be creating "a little class within the larger class." Although he succeeded in naming this as the problem to which he wanted to attend, he was not successful in focussing the conference dialogue around an exploration of its details. This was largely the result of the principal's preoccupation with the "teacher proximity to pupils" theme, her reported concern that Barry not interpret negatively her suggestion about moving the overhead projector, and her ultimate decision to move on to a different aspect of the lesson. Ironically, the next few minutes of the conference contained a somewhat convoluted monologue on the part of the principal to which Barry listened respectfully but, unlike his responses during the rest of the conference, did not participate. It would seem that Barry was left to muse alone on how to address that aspect of the lesson which had, for him, emerged as a consequential dilemma; namely, how

to engage previously uninvolved pupils who, possibly because of differing ability levels, functioned as a class within a class.

Whether Barry successfully thought through this dilemma on his own and reframed the instructional context to attend to it cannot be ascertained from the study's data. Nor is it important to the discussion. What is important is that this reframing did not take place during the supervisory intervention. Barry's alluding to this critical instructional dilemma was not explored in the conference dialogue and an opportunity for him to engage in the reflective transformation of his classroom teaching was lost.

Episode Two: Avoiding "Dead-Time"

This episode focussed on a discussion of how the teacher could prevent the last few minutes of a lesson becoming "dead-time".

PRINCIPAL: One of the kids asked about the overhead and you made the comment about...the overhead and that's exactly what I was requesting... that when you bring in what may seem to be extraneous material that you want to use, to kind of open up a thing or whatever you can loose your whole class before your whole class before.....(TEACHER: Ya) and I felt that you didn't this morning and in some cases it's sometimes circumstantial and the kids really are into it and other cases it's, to me this morning it was clear that you had a very well planned lesson. You knew what you were doing. You had your goals set and you've done some work, some good work with the students to lay the foundation for being able to procede. But we do know that there are times when I an be in the lesson and... you just lose them completely....but you certainly didn't this morning.

TEACHER: I try to get them redirected on, about quarter after, to begin on the problems that I have up there on the cars. There's no, they've had it, the day was over! So you know I really didn't

PRINCIPAL: You didn't feel too successful after that time that time after.

TEACHER: No, no. Ah, they got the information off, they wrote all the questions, ah they understood when it was to be done, because it didn't have to be done, finished right then that was...

PRINCIPAL: Ok so you know....the ten minutes... what sort of thing do you do there?

TEACHER: I, I boil. (both laugh) I get mad at the situation. I, I don't mind if, maybe up to five minutes where alright, I've accomplished what I wanted to accomplish and we happen to finish a bit early. Alright let's just gather up our books and sit for a couple of minutes. If you like you can go on with something you want to do. But that was, that was just a couple of minutes longer than what I wanted to ....I just wanted to pack it up and that's it for now And, no they just, there was, well it was after eight problems, you know nce you provide interest for diverting..... they get carried way with that and they have trouble

with the smallest, the personal responsibility to them alright you know let's get on with the job.

PRINCIPAL: Well, you know, maybe um you know ..... of course try to think about it you know not just in your class but in all classes, because there are those sort of five to ten minute times sometimes when maybe we just have to recognize the fact that as you have that in, in many of these cases that's it as far as the kids are concerned. You're not going to get more out of them and maybe we need to look at, although you had such a variation, um maybe just for that time you need to be thinking some very sort of short productive kind of thing that can be done at these times. Kind of have those sort of things there. It may be just a recognition of well, what's realistic, I suppose.

TEACHER: Yes, um well maybe it's just like we were saying before we we....on the Arts Network. (PRINCIPAL: Mmm) We do it for the kids all the time (laughs) but you know that's an hour and a half and by the end of an hour they're just getting fed up with the whole thing. Don't want to work.

PRINCIPAL: Well you know, I don't know, but, and maybe that's the time for each teacher to maybe find something they're really comfortable with. I used to like reading poetry. And yet, I didn't get comfortable with spending long periods on on poetry, but I did find it in a short few minutes that I could may be do something, just, the kids would often be quite willing to just sit and be read do.

TEACHER: That's a good idea. Just you know what sort of things, I hate giving something to the kids that they see quite clearly is this is to keep us busy for the next four minutes.(PRINCIPAL: Ya) And has absolutely nothing to do with what we were doing.

PRINCIPAL: But something important for you.

TEACHER: Ya, but something that is recognized as poem, this is just a little bit of relaxation and it's, ya, whether it's, you have to pick some things out of the newpaper for instance. Or you know the poetry comes and just to have sort of on hand that right we are finished a few minutes early you just go, good alright go to that just, just relax for a minute.

PRINCIPAL: Or maybe...

TEACHER: Let me read this.

PRINCIPAL: (garbled) so that may be something you're reading from the library that's interesting.....so that may be something to think about. But you know, in thinking about this after and thinking how can we have a conference about this because it was absolutely super, just a super lesson.

TEACHER: Well I was really pleased with it and I'm glad you (overlap of voices, teacher laughs).

PRINCIPAL: Well I realy enjoyed it, it was a good time and certainly very, very productive time too.....a great deal of...not just with they learned but it was a

highly motivating lesson and I think it was very, very productive in the way that it focused the kids on math as being something that was not just out of the textbook, it was.....Anyway thank you very much

Towards the end of the conference an interesting turn of events takes place. Margaret notes how Barry used extraneous material in the lesson to arouse the pupils' interest but is impressed that he did not lose the pupils' attention nor the lesson's focus in doing so. Indeed, she makes the point twice that such an approach could take the lesson off-task but that it did not happen in this case because the lesson had been very well planned. In her recall interview, the principal characterized this episode as being indicative of success in conferencing. By that she meant that when a teacher can feel good about something he or she has done in the classroom but can also reflect on what he or she could have done had things in the lesson gone awry, the conference has enjoyed an element of success. In the conference, principal Margaret has commended Barry for his effective use of extraneous material while twice noting that such situations could easily go awry. Following on this, Barry volunteers that the lesson did indeed begin to fall apart just before the end of the period and just after the principal had had to leave the classroom. In doing so, the teacher confirms that principal's hunch that such diversions can sometimes lead the lesson astray and provides an example of what Margaret regarded as successful conferencing.

Barry suggests that the lesson began to fall apart at the end because the pupils had worked hard for too long a period of time. Margaret chooses to explore what he typically does in situations in which such a break-down occurs up to ten minutes before the end of the lesson. Barry responds that, if it occurs with only less than five minutes remaining, he effects closure. If, however, it happens sooner in the lesson, then he admits he is sometimes bereft of ideas and asks the principal for advice. Margaret empathizes with the predicament Barry has described (she uses the "we" strategy here) but also adds that this kind of dilemma is a normal one and that teachers need then to plan some short activities which can productively fill the remaining minutes. She goes on to share how she always used to read poetry to pupils when she felt they had reached their saturation point. This provided a change of pace for the pupils but still fulfilled the teacher's mandate to be educating the pupils. Barry immediately warms to this suggestion because it appeals to his basic philosophy that children should not be given busy work merely to fill the time. The principal's suggestion also prompts him to muse out loud about how he could have read something else out of the newspaper to the pupils. This insight on the teacher's part that back-up instructional activities need not be busy work but can fulfil an educational purpose, marks the end of what principal Margaret regarded as a successful conferencing episode. She closes the conference by reiterating how impressed she was with Barry's ability to bring Mathematics alive in a manner that was highly motivating of pupil learning.

Episode Two: Analysis

When the principal commended Barry for his use of extraneous material, she also noted that such situations could easily go awry. This comment, together with

the respect that Barry held for the principal's professional and supportive approach to instructional supervision, afforded him the opportunity to disclose that the lesson began to fall apart at the end. The principal, who had not been present when this disintegration had happened, empathized with the predicament and explored what he generally does when such a break-down occurs. This exploration led Barry to admit that he was sometimes bereft of ideas and to ask her for professional advice. In so doing, Barry was naming the problem. He was unable to come up with educationally sound ways of filling the remaining minutes of a lesson when the planned material had been exhausted. The principal accepted this as the problem and began to share how she always used to read poetry to pupils towards the end of a lesson when she felt they needed a change of pace. This reporting by the principal of how she had tackled a situation similar to the dilemma that he had described immediately fired Barry's interest; for he saw, perhaps for the first time, that such fill-in activities did not necessarily constitute busy work.

This fresh appreciation on the part of Barry of the potentially educative purpose of end-of-lesson additional activities is a noteworthy instance of the generative quality of reflective transformation. The principal's shared experience has facilitated a reconstruction of his prevailing view of fill-in activities such that it has led to a new understanding of their educational significance. Having reframed the context within which he thought of such activities, Barry then experienced a further enriching instance of reflective transformation. He suddenly realized that he could have read something else out of the newspaper material he had used in the third and final segment of the lesson. In so doing, he was seeing his end-of-lesson classroom teaching as a version of his principal's. Her reported actions had served as a metaphor which prompted him to reframe his own teaching in a highly creative yet exploratory way. He did not *transfer* the principal's reported activity, i.e., poetry, to the context of his teaching; rather, he *transformed* both the activity (from reading poetry to reading a newspaper article) and his teaching context (from dead-time or busy-work to educationally significant work) in the process.

Four factors working together would seem to account for this double portion of teacher development through reflective transformation. First, the teacher *named* the problem which was explored in the conference. Second, the principal did not, in this instance, have an agenda of her own and consequently *accepted* and *explored* the problem identified by the teacher. Third, the teacher felt secure enough in the *supportive* atmosphere engendered by the principal to take a professional *risk* in admitting a shortcoming and asking for assistance. Fourth, the principal's empathetic sharing of how she tackled the problem enabled the teacher to *reconstruct* his view of fill-in activities and *reframe* the context of the lesson in which he had originally experienced the problem. It would seem that a key factor in this episode had to do with the principal's absence when the lesson disintegration occurred. This coincidence enabled two things to happen which, the larger study's (Grimmett & Crehan, 1988) findings suggest, typically do not happen in instructional supervision: first, the teacher's definition of the problem, as distinct from the principal's, oriented the conference dialogue and, second, the principal functioned as a truly empathetic colleague

THE NATURE OF COLLEGIALITY IN INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION

The previous four episodes were selected because they contained instances of teachers seemingly on the verge of engaging in the reflective transformation of their respective classroom experience. Yet the analysis has shown that this process was consummated in only one of the four episodes. How, then, were the conditions at work in this fourth episode different from those operative in the other three? Further, what do these episodes tell us about the different conceptions of collegiality at work in instructional supervision settings? Finally, how can the essential differences between these kinds of collegiality be conceptualized?

The Four Episodes Compared

The first and second episodes saw teacher Audrey name the problem as prop distribution. The principal, however, who by this time in the conference had changed from being facilitative to being directive, refocussed the problem on prop collection in order to reframe the context in terms of using pupil monitors to execute that process. Ignoring or oblivious to the fact that Audrey had used pupil monitors in the prop distribution process, the principal had essentially named the problem to which Audrey should attend and reframed for her the way in which she could change her practice. Thus, despite being on the verge of engaging in reflective transformation, Audrey did not gain a fresh appreciation of her prop distribution and collection processes. Indeed, the principal eventually perceived her as acting recalcitrantly in her denial of responsibility for observed classroom events.

The third episode was similar to and different from the first two episodes. It was similar in the sense that Barry's naming of the problem as engaging the uninvolved pupils who formed a class within a class was refocussed by the principal around the theme of teacher proximity to pupils. The result was that her suggestion about changing the position of the overhead projector constituted a reframing of the instructional context according to the principal's definition of the problem and not the teacher's. It was dissimilar, however, in so far as the principal's refocussing did not constitute a deliberate overriding of an indomitable teacher but was more the product of a keenly supportive and respectful mind which failed to grasp the deeper significance of the teacher's problem. It was also different in the sense that the principal's suggestion was offered as a tentative hypothesis to be tested out in action whereas the principal in Audrey's case was, at that point in the conference, attempting to impose his suggestion as a solution to the problem which he himself had named.

The fourth episode proved to be very different from the previous three. The teacher named the problem as dealing with end-of-lesson activities in an educationally sound manner. The principal, who had not observed the final minutes of the lesson in which a breakdown had occurred, accepted the teacher's articulation of the problem and empathetically explored the issue with him. Her sharing of how she typically had tackled such a problem enabled the teacher to reconstruct his view of such end-of-lesson activities' educational significance and reframe the context in which the disintegration had occurred. This episode, then, proved to be the only one in which the teacher engaged in the reflective transformation of classroom experience. The intriguing aspect of this episode is

that the classroom events pertaining to the problem focussed upon in the conference dialogue had not been observed by the principal but were voluntarily described by the teacher. Whether the teacher would have volunteered such information in a supervisory relationship characterized by less supportiveness and professional respect, or whether the principal would have accepted the teacher's naming of the problem so readily had she observed the actual events herself, are fascinating points of speculation.

In all episodes except the last, the teacher's naming of the problem was, either wittingly or unwittingly, not accepted by the principal and the subsequent reframing of the instructional context was therefore not owned by the teacher. As a consequence, the reflective transformation of classroom experience did not occur. In the last episode, however, the teacher's articulation of the problem was accepted and he, not the principal, reframed the context in which the problem could be addressed. The similarities and differences found between and among these four episodes would seem to suggest that different conceptions of collegiality can be at work in instructional supervision settings.

Conceptions of Collegiality and Instructional Supervision

Two broad conceptions of collegiality seemed to be at work in the cases of Audrey and Brian, namely contrived collegiality[10] and interdependent collegiality. Each of these will be discussed in turn.

Contrived Collegiality

Hargreaves (1989) described contrived collegiality as being:

> characterized by a set of more formal, bureaucratically provided arrangements to increase the attention given to joint teacher planning. It is exemplified in initiatives such as peer coaching, mentor teaching, joint planning in separately provided planning rooms, formally scheduled meetings and written job descriptions. It contrives to graft collaboration by administrative requirement on to what otherwise might be unsympathetic patterns of collegial relations within schools. (p. 3)

In other words, the emphasis is placed on fulfilling the form of collegiality without regard for the spirit or underlying assumptions of collegiality. It is as if it has become mandatory that teachers collaborate voluntarily.

Close examination of the foregoing episodes would suggest that this conception of collegiality manifests itself in two distinctively different ways, namely administratively imposed collegiality and organizationally induced collegiality.

Administratively imposed collegiality. The case of Audrey exemplifies this type of contrived collegiality. In the two episodes that were reported (which came towards the end of the second conference rather than at the beginning of either

---

[10] Credit for this term must go to Andy Hargreaves who first brought it to my attention in January, 1989

conference), Audrey's principal tended to adopt a unilateral orientation; that is, he began to present her with a ready-made solution to the instructional problem he had identified. Under these conditions, Audrey became reluctant to initiate self-appraisal but tended to tailor her responses to the situational demands that arose out of the teaching behaviour proposed by the principal. Consequently, she neither insisted on returning the focus of the conference dialogue to the problem she had attempted to name, nor did she assert too rigorously the fact that she had at least partially tried during the distribution process the solution which the principal was proposing for the collection process. Her reticence on these two points indicates that she likely perceived the criteria used for lesson appraisal to have been determined solely by the principal, a point corroborated by his decision to countervail clinical supervision norms and not hold a pre-conference. Consequently, Audrey behaved in a manner suggestive of distrust and resistance to self-disclosure. She tended to emit diffuse and misleading cues as a means of preventing supervisory control of her teaching and only generated ideas which deflected the purpose of supervisory intervention away from instructional improvement. It would seem that when clinical supervision is interpreted as a form of collegiality which emphasises the principal as the "fount of all knowledge", as it were, the end result is one of administratively imposed collegiality. The case of Barry, however, demonstrates that collegiality can also be organizationally induced.

Organizationally induced collegiality. By being placed in a "common language" group to practice clinical supervision, Barry and his principal found themselves under organizational conditions which induced a form of collegiality. The third episode demonstrates that both were extremely respectful and supportive of the other. There had been a definite sharing of the ideas and materials they had studied together and this gave them a common framework when discussing Barry's teaching. However, the third episode also documents how this form of contrived collegiality did not lead to Barry's development as a teacher through the reflective transformation of his classroom experience. The impasse occurred when the principal had difficulty in seeing the problem of how to involve the class within a class in any terms other than those which constituted the focus of their "common language"--in this case, classroom management. Barry, on the other hand, showed signs of transcending the parameters of this material as he began to view the problem more in terms of different pupil ability levels than in terms of classroom management. This would seem to suggest two points about clinical supervision conducted under this form of collegiality. First, principals and/or teachers (frequently dependent on their level of conceptual complexity) may be so bounded by the substantive focus of the "common language" that they cannot deal collegially with problems outside that focus. Second, within the confines of that focus, the shared language produced through the organizationally induced collegiality of a "common language" approach can sometimes lead to a higher form of collegiality which is not organizationally contrived, namely interdependent collegiality.

Interdependent Collegiality

The fourth episode documented above shows that when the principal accepts and explores the teacher's identified problem, reflective transformation of experience can take place. More importantly, when such a process takes place, the participants forget about rank and function as true professional colleagues.

Interdependent collegiality occurred when Barry and the principal transcended rank and form to epitomize the spirit and culture of collegiality. Under interdependent conditions, Barry began to view his own behaviour as a causal factor in his professional development and valued input from the principal as a source of information he could appraise. Such information was given and received for the purpose of clarifying Barry's behaviour in terms of his own defined world of reality rather than in reference to a fixed, external standard. As consequence, exploration and experimentation were encouraged and Barry essentially developed through careful reflection on the consequences of his own instructional actions, including his reported failure.

The cases of Audrey and Barry would suggest that two broad conceptions of collegiality are at work in instructional supervision settings; contrived collegiality, with its two forms of administrative imposed and organizationally induced conditions, and interdependent collegiality, with its potential for fostering teacher development through the reflective transformation of experience. How, then, can the apparent differences between contrived and interdependent collegiality be explained?

Making Sense of the Differences Between Contrived and Interdependent Collegiality

Little (1981) described collegiality in terms of organizational conditions. Her emphasis on conditions, however, did not distinguish between the practices which are basic to collegiality, e.g., teachers talk, observe, plan, teach, etc., and the underlying assumptions (beliefs and values) that make up the culture of collegiality. Contrived collegiality can be said to reproduce the artifacts of that culture, i.e., its public practices, without reference to or internalization of the beliefs and values that constitute the deep orienting assumptions of the culture of collegiality. By contrast, interdependent collegiality would seem to be less preoccupied with the artifacts and much more concerned with the essential philosophy behind collaboration. Put differently, the practices of interdependent collegiality are regarded as the outworking of the beliefs and values underlying the conception rather than forms of practice to be encouraged in and of themselves.

Figure 1 depicts this view of interdependent collegiality as a culture. The practice of talk about teaching represents the public outworking of the belief that such talk between teachers will "build up a shared language, adequate to the complexity of teaching" (Little, 1981, p. 12), thereby enlarging the teachers' understanding of their own practice. The value assumption behind such talk is that the possession of such a shared language is to be preferred over idiosyncratic and individualistic perceptions of classroom reality.

The practice of teachers observing one another is essentially the outgrowth of the belief that observation will provide "shared referents for the shared language of

teaching" (Little, 1981, p. 12), thereby contextualizing the talk about teaching. The value in this is that focussed talk about teaching is to be preferred over inprecise and undifferentiated talk.

Teachers engaging in joint planning represents the outworking of the belief that talk about teaching needs to be reinforced by concrete actions which foster collaboration. The value behind this practice lies in the preference for the shaping of a task and its outcomes by the work of many minds rather than by the work of one mind, no matter how brilliant that mind may or may not be.

Teaching one another the practice of teaching is the essential outgrowth of the belief that such a process will provide teachers with opportunities for demonstration and risk-taking. The value behind this practice lies in the preference of role-taking, risk-taking behaviour for adult development over isolationist, avoidance tendencies.

Relative to the two forms of contrived collegiality, interdependent collegiality functions as a culture in which strongly held values and beliefs orient teachers to certain practices. By contrast, contrived collegiality puts in place those administrative fiats and organizational inducements which mandate and/or encourage teachers to engage in the practices of collegiality for their own sake. Occasional movement is possible from the organizationally induced form of contrived collegiality to the interdependent culture (as in the case of Barry in the second of his two episodes). It can be argued, however, as Crehan and Grimmett (1989) do, that this came about as a result of the teacher's conceptual ability and not from anything peculiar to the instructional supervision process per se. In the main, then, contrived collegiality and interdependent collegiality appear to go their separate ways, working according to their different purposes. Whereas a great deal of sophistry surrounds the articulation of the purposes of contrived collegiality (Grimmett, 1987), the purpose of interdependent collegiality is crystallized around teacher development and instructional improvement.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Can instructional supervision truly foster a culture of interdependent collegiality which enables teachers to engage in the reflective transformation of their classroom experience? The case of Audrey provides an example of a teacher who desperately needed to transform her classroom practice but whose development was not aided much by the supervisory intervention of her principal. It could clearly be argued that a teacher like Audrey would have had similar difficulties even when working with colleague teachers in a joint study group or a similarly collegial arrangement. Yet it could also be argued that Audrey's personal biography and professional history contained few if any negative experiences relating to such an endeavour and that the conditions of interdependent collegiality might therefore prove to be professionally releasing and empowering of her much needed development as a classroom teacher. Audrey's case, then, provides a definite negative answer to the question posed above.

The case of Barry, however, initially produces a sense of ambivalence. On the one hand, a vital opportunity for growth and development is missed because the principal and teacher appear to talk past each other on the point at issue. On the other hand, Barry does manifest evidence of engaging in the reflective transformation of his classroom experience. Close examination of the circumstances pertaining to the instance when this actually occurred, however, reveals certain patterns, i.e., the supervisor not observing the entire lesson, which are different from regular clinical supervision practice. Therefore, although the case of Barry suggests that clinical supervision can lead to moments of teacher development, the episode containing such development could nevertheless have also happened with a colleague teacher.

It would seem, then, that instructional supervision only rarely fosters a culture of interdependent collegiality in which teachers can reflectively transform their classroom experience. On those rare occasions when it happens, it is either the result of serendipitous events or of a careful grounding of the supervisory relationship in the personal biographies and professional histories of teacher and principal before any classroom observation takes place.[11] Since most principals are subject to such institutional time constraints and job pressures that they cannot afford the time needed for such a rigorous endeavour, it usually occurs serendipitously. Teachers, however, are reticent to invade other colleagues' professional space (by observing and critiquing instruction) without first taking time to understand them personally and professionally (Chism, 1985). Consequently, the claim can be advanced that teacher development through the reflective transformation of experience is more likely to occur when teachers work collaboratively with other teachers in a culture of interdependent collegiality rather than when they work with their principals in conditions of contrived collegiality under the aegis of instructional supervision.

---

[11] Crehan & Grimmett (1989) present findings which suggest strongly that such development is the result of the teacher's conceptual level more so than anything that a principal does or a principal and teacher do in instructional supervision. These findings merely add more weight to the mounting evidence that teachers learn best from other teachers, rather than instructional supervisors.

REFERENCES

Bussis, A., Chittenden, E., & Amarel, M. (1976). *Beyond surface curriculum.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Chism, N. (1985). *The place of peer interaction in teacher development: Findings from a case study.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the AERA, Chicago, Illinois.

Cogan, M.L. (1973). *Clinical supervision.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Connelly, F.M., & Clandinin, D.J. (1988). *Teachers as curriculum planners: Narratives of experience.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Crehan, E.P., and Grimmett, P.P. (1989). *Teachers' perspectives on dyadic supervisory interaction* Paper accepted for presentation at the annual meeting of the AERA, San Francisco, CA.

Dombart, P.M. (1985). The "vision" of an insider: A practitioner's view. *Educational Leadership, 43*(3), 70-73.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Handbook of teaching and policy* (pp. 150-170). New York: Longman.

Glickman, C.D. (1985). *Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R.H., and Krajewski, R.J. (1980). *Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers* (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Goodlad, J.I. (1984). *A place called school.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Grimmett, P.P. (1984). The supervision conference: An investigation of supervisory effectiveness through analysis of participants' conceptual functioning. In P.P. Grimmett (Ed.), *Research in teacher education: Current problems and future projects in Canada.* Vancouver: CSTE/CSCI, pp. 131-166.

Grimmett, P.P. (1987). The role of district supervisors in the implementation of peer coaching. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 3*(1), 3-28.

Grimmett, P.P., & Crehan, E.P. (1988). *A study of the effects of supervisory intervention on teachers' classroom management performance: Final report.* Report submitted to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, Ottawa.

Grimmett, P.P. (1988). The nature of reflection and Schön's conception in perspective. In P.P. Grimmett & G.L. Erickson (Eds.). *Reflection in teacher education*, (pp. 5-15). New York: Teachers College Press.

Grimmett, P.P. (1989). Teacher planning, collegiality and the education of teachers. In L. Katz & J. Rath (Eds.). *Advances in teacher education*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Co.

Grimmett, P.P., MacKinnon, A.M., Erickson, G.L., & Riecken, T.J. (1989). Reflective practice in teacher education. In R. Houston, R. Cliff, & M. Pugach (Eds.). *Encouraging reflective practice: An examination of issues and exemplars*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hargreaves, A. (1989). Contrived collegiality and the culture of teaching. Paper accepted for presentation at the annual meeting of the Canadian Association for Teacher Education, Quebec City.

Huberman, M. (1980). *Finding and using recipes for busy kitchens: A situational analysis of routine knowledge use in schools.* Washington, DC: NIE.

Hunter, M. (1984). Knowing, teaching, supervising. In P.L. Hosford (Ed.), *Using what we know about teaching.* Alexandria: Va.: ASCD, pp. 169-203.

Jackson, P.W. (1968). *Life in classrooms.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1982). The coaching of teaching. *Educational Leadership, 39*(1).

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1983). *Power in staff development through research in training.* Alexandria, VA.: ASCD.

Kennedy, M.M. (1984). How evidence alters understanding and decisions. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 6*: 207-226.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M (1980). *Metaphors we live by.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1979). The social realities of teaching. In A. Lieberman & L. Miller (Eds.), *Staff development* (pp. 54-68). New York: Teachers College Press.

Little, J.W. (1981). *The power of organizational setting: School norms and staff development.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the AERA, Los Angeles, California.

Little, J.W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. *American Educational Research Journal, 19*(3), 325-340.

Little, J.W. (1987). Teachers as colleagues. In V.R. Koehler (Ed.), *Educators' handbook: A research perspective* (pp. 491-518). New York: Longman.

Lortie, D.C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Meyer, J., Cohen, E., Brunetti, F., Molnar, S., & Lueders-Salmon, E. (1971). *The impact of the open-space school upon teacher influence and autonomy: The effects of an organizational innovation.* (Technical Report #21). Stanford, CA: Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Stanford University.

Mosher, R.L. and Purpel, D. (1972). *Supervision: The reluctant profession.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Rosenholtz, S. (1985). Political myths about education reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 66*(5), 349-351.

Schön, D.A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action.* New York: Basic Books.

Schön, D.A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schön, D.A. (1988). Coaching reflective teaching. In P.P. Grimmett & G.L. Erickson (Eds.). *Reflection in teacher education,* (pp. 19-29). New York: Teachers College Press.

Sergiovanni, T.J. and Starratt, R.J. (1988). *Supervision: Human perspectives* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Silver, C.B. (1973). *Black teachers in urban schools.* New York: Praeger.

Sizer, T. (1984). *Horace's compromize.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1980). Supervision: An educative or mis-educative process? *Journal of Teacher Education,* (4), 17-20.

Zumwalt, K.K. (1982). Research on teaching: Policy implications for teacher education. In A. Lieberman & M. McLaughlin (Eds.), *Policy making in education* (pp. 215-248). Chicago: NSSE.